

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 11-21 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-9 and 11-21 were rejected.

Claim 1 is amended herein.

Claims 18-21 are cancelled.

I. 35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections

Independent claims 1, 18 and 21, along with dependent claim 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fernandez *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,697,103) in view of Coles (U.S. Patent No. 5,712,679). Independent claim 1 has been amended herein and independent claims 18 and 21, along with claims depending therefrom, have been cancelled. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration thereof based on those amendments and cancellations, and the arguments presented below.

The thrust of the invention here is a method for orientation of surveillance equipment provided at fixed locations in response to a request, via a mobile terminal located proximate to the surveillance equipment and in wireless communication with a controller for the surveillance equipment having the capability of changing the orientation of the surveillance equipment in respect to the particular area surveilled. According to the method of the invention, a mobile terminal user wishing to initiate surveillance of an area in which the user is located (which area being proximate to installed surveillance equipment) initiates a request to a controller of the surveillance equipment, via a wireless communications link, for such surveillance and transmits the users geographic location. Based on the received request and the location information for the mobile terminal, the controller causes the surveillance equipment to be oriented in such a manner to provide surveillance of the user's location.

The Applicants believe it clear that neither Fernandez or Coles, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests the idea of surveillance of an area being initiated by a request from a mobile terminal located proximate to surveillance equipment controlled from a remote controller, via wireless communication of the request and location information for the mobile terminal from the terminal to the remote controller. Nonetheless, the Applicants recognize that their initial claims

may have been framed in a manner that could be interpreted in a manner to be subject to the present rejection, and have accordingly amended independent claim 1 in a manner intended to more clearly reflect the distinction described herein. With that amendment of claim 1 and the cancellation of the remaining independent claims, the Applicants respectfully submit that their independent claim now clearly distinguishes over the cited art. Withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claims 1-2 (claim 2 being dependent from independent claim 1) is accordingly respectfully requested.

Various other dependent claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fernandez in view of Coles and at least one other reference. Except for rejected claims cancelled herein, all of these rejected claims depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, which was shown above to be patentable over the Fernandez/Cole combination, and therefore should be patentable as well based on that dependency.

II. Conclusion

If the Examiner should feel that the application is not yet in a condition for allowance and that a telephone interview would be useful, he is invited to contact applicants' undersigned attorney at (973) 386-4237.

Respectfully submitted,



John A. Ligon
Reg. No. 35,938
Attorney for Applicant

Date: January 25, 2008

Docket Administrator (Room 2F-190)
Alcatel Lucent
600 Mountain Avenue
P. O. Box 636
Murray Hill, New Jersey 07974-0636